IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
AT JAIPUR BENCH, JAIPUR

J U D G M E N T

(1) S.B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. 415/1999
DR. (MRS.) PARUL DEV nee GUPTA Vs. UNIVERSITY OF RAJ.
with
(2) S.B. CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO. 1442/1999
DR. AMAR CHAND SINGHAL Vs. UNIVERSITY OF RAJASTHAN

Date: 14.12.2006.

HON'BLE MR. K.S. RATHORE, J.

Mr. Vijay Singh &
Mr. Bipin Gupta for the petitioners.
Mr. A.K. Sharma with
Mr. Mukesh Meena for the respondent.

****

Since both the writ petitions are identical in nature and involve similar question of law, therefore, they are being decided by this common judgment.

The short controversy is that the petitioners are working as Assistant Professor in respective subjects in University of Rajasthan. The only grievance of the petitioners is that pursuant to the judgment rendered by this Court in ***S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4362/96- Om Prakash Pareek Vs. University of Rajasthan & another, along with connection writ petitions dated 11th October, 1996,*** the petitioners are not screened and also not given adhoc appointment as were given to the

similarly situated other persons who are working in the University. At the moment they are not in service.

Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondent University submits that the petitioners were called for screening but they failed to fulfill the requisite requirements, therefore, the case of the petitioners was not screened and since opportunity was afforded, now again the matter cannot be re-opened. It is further given out by the learned counsel for the University that no vacancy is still lying vacant.

Be that as it may, looking to the facts and circumstances of the case, the petitioners are entitled to be screened and as stated by the learned counsel for the University that they have failed to comply with the direction, to this effect the petitioners are at liberty to represent before the University for screening pursuant to the judgment rendered by this Court on 11.10.96 in the case of ***Om Prakash Pareek Vs. University of Rajasthan & another (supra),*** as it is not disputed that they are not in service and if the petitioners are otherwise found eligible for screening and the posts are still lying vacant, they may be screened by the University. It is for the University to consider the representation so filed by the petitioners.

With these observations, both the writ petitions stand disposed of.

(K.S. RATHORE),J.

/KKC/